arXiv:1210.1556v1 [quant-ph] 4 Oct 2012

Quantum steering with bound entanglement

Nicolas Brunner[1, 2] and Daniel Cavalcanti[3]
[1]*Département de Physique Théorique, Université de Genève, 1211 Genève, Switzerland*
[2]*H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol,*
Tyndall Avenue, Bristol, BS8 1TL, United Kingdom
[3]*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 117542 Singapore*

Quantum steering, loosely speaking the distribution of entanglement from an untrusted party, is a form of quantum nonlocality which is intermediate between entanglement and Bell nonlocality. Determining which states can be steered is important from a conceptual point of view, but also for applications, e.g. in quantum cryptography. Here we show that bound entanglement, although it represents the weakest form of entanglement, can nevertheless lead to quantum steering. This is done by noticing that steering inequalities can be derived from entropic uncertainty relations. Our result has implications on the connection between entanglement distillability and nonlocality, and shows that bound entangled states can be useful for information-theoretic tasks featuring an untrusted party.

INTRODUCTION

Quantum theory allows for distant systems to be correlated in a way that admits no analogue in classical physics. A particularly striking aspect of this phenomenon is quantum steering, first discussed by Schrödinger [1]. Consider two remote observers sharing entanglement. The first observer, by performing a measurement on his system in a given basis, can steer the state of the system held by the second observer. Importantly this effect is witnessed by the strong correlations observed between the observer's measurement outcomes, and it is the intrinsic randomness of quantum theory that prevents this effect to lead to instantaneous signaling.

Recently, Wiseman, Jones and Doherty [2] formalized quantum steering as an information theoretic task, which is basically the distribution of entanglement from an untrusted party. Remarkably, steering turns out to be a novel form of nonlocality in quantum mechanics, that is somehow intermediate between entanglement and nonlocality [2]. Not all entangled states lead to steering, and not all steerable states violate a Bell inequality. Steering can be certified experimentally using steering inequalities [3], in some sense analogue to Bell inequalities. A growing interest in quantum steering has been witnessed recently, featuring experimental confirmations [4], including a loophole-free experimental demonstration [5].

Beyond the conceptual interest, steering is also relevant for information-theoretic applications. For instance, a protocol for quantum key distribution where the security is based on steering was recently proposed [6]. Notably, this approach appears as a promising alternative (or step towards) device-independent quantum cryptography [7], as its experimental implementation is less demanding.

It is therefore natural to ask which entangled states, or more generally which forms of entanglement, lead to quantum steering. Importantly, answering this question will have implications from both the conceptual and the applied point of view.

Here we make progress in this direction by showing that bound entanglement [8], although it represents the weakest form of entanglement in quantum theory, can nevertheless lead to quantum steering. Hence bound entanglement can be useful for information-theoretic tasks with an untrusted party. Bound entanglement is a form of entanglement that cannot be distilled. Therefore, although entanglement is required to form bound entangled states, no pure entanglement can be extracted out of them, hence highlighting a phenomenon of irreversibility in quantum theory [9]. A central ingredient for demonstrating our result consists in noticing that a steering inequality can be readily obtained from any entropic uncertainty relation (EUR) [10, 11]. The latter, which attracted considerable attention in the last years (see [12] for a survey), were known to detect entanglement [13]. The present connection is useful, as it gives steering inequalities for systems of arbitrary dimension, including continuous variable systems as discussed in Ref. [14], and establishes a direct link between one-way entanglement distillation and steering.

Finally, our result also represents progress towards a disproof of the Peres conjecture [16], a longstanding problem in the foundations of quantum mechanics. In 1999, Peres conjectured that nonlocal correlations (in the sense of Bell) can not be obtained from bound entangled states. The conjecture has already been disproven in the multipartite case [17]. However, for the case of two parties, originally discussed by Peres, all results derived so far give evidence that the conjecture might in fact hold. In particular, direct links between the violation of certain classes of Bell inequalities were shown to imply distillability of entanglement [18]. By showing that bound entanglement can lead to steering, we make progress towards disproving the Peres conjecture, since steering is a necessary (although not sufficient) requirement for Bell nonlocality. More importantly our result shows that steering does not imply entanglement distillability.

ENTROPIC UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS AS STEERING INEQUALITIES

Consider the probability distribution $P_i = \mathrm{Tr}(M_i \rho)$ of the possible results i of a measurement M defined by a set of measurement operators $\{M_i\}$ ($M_i \leq \mathbb{1}$ and $\sum_i M_i = \mathbb{1}$) when applied to a quantum state ρ. The degree of predictability of the measurement outcomes of M can be measured through the Shannon entropy of the probability distribution P_i, *i.e.*

$$H(M) = -\sum_i P_i \log P_i, \tag{1}$$

where $0 \log 0 = 0$ is considered. If the result of the measurement is predictable with certainty, *i.e.* $P_i = 1$ for a given i, then $H(M) = 0$. On the other hand, if all measurement outcomes occur with the same probability, $H(M)$ is maximal.

Uncertainty relations aim to relate the predictability of different measurements $M^{(1)}, .., M^{(n)}$. They take the form

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} H(M^{(k)}) \geq c_{\mathcal{M}} \tag{2}$$

where $c_{\mathcal{M}} > 0$ is a constant that depends solely on the considered set of measurements $\mathcal{M} = \{M^{(1)}, .., M^{(n)}\}$ (in fact $c_{\mathcal{M}}$ can be taken as the minimum of the left-hand-side among all possible quantum states ρ). Inequality (2) shows that it is not possible to predict the measurement outcomes of all possible measurements perfectly, no matter which state is used. That is, these measurements are incompatible. As an example, consider two spin-1/2 measurements given by the Pauli matrices σ_x and σ_z. The following uncertainty relation holds:

$$H(\sigma_x) + H(\sigma_z) \geq 1, \tag{3}$$

where the log is taken to be in base 2. A survey of entropic uncertainty relations can be found in Ref. [12].

We will see now that steering inequalities can be derived straightforwardly from EURs. Let us first recall the scenario of steering tests. Consider two remote parties, Alice and Bob. Alice wants to convince Bob, who does not trust her, that she can prepare pairs of entangled particles. Upon receiving his particle from Alice, Bob chooses a measurement setting k (from a pre-determined set of n measurements $\mathcal{M} = \{M^{(1)}, .., M^{(n)}\}$) to perform on his system and announces this choice to Alice. Next, Alice announces her result (or the outcome of her measurement), which Bob records together with the result of his own measurement. After repeating this elementary procedure a sufficient number of times, Bob can estimate the steering parameter T, which loosely speaking captures how strongly Alice's outcome is correlated to that of Bob. If T is found to be smaller than a certain bound C, then Bob must conclude that Alice did indeed prepare entanglement. If not, then Bob concludes that Alice is cheating and sending him a quantum state that is only classically correlated to her system.

The main point in deriving a valid steering inequality is to find a bound on the quantity T that holds for any cheating strategy that Alice could possibly adopt. In this respect, EURs are very convenient. Define the steering parameter as $T = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} H(M^{(k)}|A_k)$, where $H(M^{(k)}|A_k)$ is the entropy of Bob's k-th measurement, given the knowledge of Alice's result A_k (formally, $H(M^{(k)}|A_k)$ is the Shannon entropy of the conditional probability of Bob's results given Alice's outcome). Since EURs of the form (2) hold for any local state (hence encompassing any possible cheating strategy of Alice), we immediately get the steering inequality

$$T = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} H(M^{(k)}|A_k) \geq c_{\mathcal{M}}. \tag{4}$$

Intuitively this should be understood as follows. If Alice tries to cheat, and prepares for Bob a local state ρ, she will not be able to predict Bob's measurements outcomes with a precision better than the one imposed by the EUR. This is clearly also the case if Alice sends to Bob half of a separable state $\sum_k p_k \rho_k^A \otimes \rho_k^B$, which can be seen as a probabilistic state preparation where Alice "keeps track" of which state she sent to Bob by looking at her subsystem ρ_k^A.

However, in the case Alice is honest and sends half of an entangled state to Bob, she will be able, by performing an appropriate measurement on her system, to predict Bob's measurement outcome better than what is imposed by the EURs. In this case, the steering inequality (4) will be violated. Interestingly, it was recently discussed how EURs must be modified in the presence of quantum memory [15], i.e. when the system under measurement is entangled with another system.

Let us illustrate the above with a simple example. Consider again the EUR given by (3). If Alice and Bob share a maximally entangled qubit Bell pair in the state $|\phi_+\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, then Alice can predict perfectly the outcome of Bob's measurement if she performs the same measurement on her system. Hence the EUR is violated, as well as the corresponding steering inequality of the form (4).

The fact that EUR can be used as steering inequalities leads to relevant obserations on the relation between entanglement and steering. For instance, in the case of two measurements it was shown that the only bipartite systems that can lead to a violation of the EUR are the ones with

$$S(\rho_A) > S(\rho_{AB}), \tag{5}$$

where $S(\rho)$ is the von Neumman entropy of the density matrix ρ [15]. On the other hand it turns out that every state satisfying condition (5) is one-way entanglement distillable [19]. In what follows we will show that bound entangled states can also be used to demonstrate steering.

QUANTUM STEERING WITH BOUND ENTANGLEMENT

Entropic uncertainty relations have been particularly investigated for the case of mutually unbiased basis (see [12]). In particular for the case of even Hilbert space dimensions d, strong bounds were derived [20]. Combining these results with the above discussion, we obtain the following steering inequality:

$$T = \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} H(\Pi^k|A_k) \geq \frac{d}{2}\log\left(\frac{d}{2}\right) + \left(\frac{d}{2}+1\right)\log\left(\frac{d}{2}+1\right) \tag{6}$$

where $\Gamma = \{\Pi^k\}_{k=1}^{d+1}$ stands for a set of mutually unbiased basis in even dimension d. In what follows, we will focus on the case $d = 4$.

Let us now consider the $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4$ bound entangled state introduced by Horodecki *et al.* in Ref. [21]. This state has a four qubit structure: Alice holds two qubits (A and A') and Bob the two remaining ones (B and B'). This state is of particular interest, as it can be used to establish a secret key [22]. It is the simplest example known to date of bound entangled state featuring privacy. Formally, the state is given by

$$\rho_{BE} = \sum_i q_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|_{AB} \otimes \rho^{(i)}_{A'B'} \tag{7}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho^{(0)} &= \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|), \\
\rho^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2}(|11\rangle\langle 11| + |\psi_3\rangle\langle\psi_3|), \\
\rho^{(2,3)} &= |\chi_\pm\rangle\langle\chi_\pm|,
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

with $|\psi_{0,1}\rangle = (|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\psi_{2,3}\rangle = (|10\rangle \pm |01\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ being the Bell states and $|\chi_\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{2\pm\sqrt{2}}|00\rangle \pm \sqrt{2\mp\sqrt{2}}|11\rangle)$. The mixing distribution $\{q_i\}_{i=0}^3$ is given by $\{\frac{p}{2}, \frac{p}{2}, \frac{1-p}{2}, \frac{1-p}{2}\}$ with $p = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1+\sqrt{2}}$.

It turns out that the state (7) violates the steering inequality (6). We first choose a set of mutually unbiased basis $\mathcal{M}$ for Bob. Then, in order to minimize the steering parameter, one must find a measurement basis for Alice (for each measurement basis of Bob) such that her measurement outcome is as correlated as possible with Bob's outcome. In particular, it turns out that here the optimal measurements for Alice do not coincide with the measurements of Bob. All details can be found in the Appendix. Finally, we obtain a violation of the steering inequality (6) of

$$T \approx 3.75 \not\geq (2\log 2 + 3\log 3) \approx 4.7. \tag{9}$$

DISCUSSION

We have highlighted a novel feature of bound entanglement, namely that it can lead to quantum steering. This represents a new addition to the astonishing properties of bound entangled states, such as containing privacy [22], and leading to Bell inequality violations in the multipartite case [17]

Our work raises further questions. First of all, it would be interesting to find other examples of bound entangled states leading to steering. One may actually wonder whether steering is a generic feature of bound entangled states, although this appears rather unlikely to us. Also worth investigating is whether there exist a link between privacy and steering.

Finally, the biggest challenge is certainly to show whether the present result can be strengthened in order to get Bell inequality violations with a bound entangled state. Given that a violation of a steering inequality is a necessary requirement for demonstrating

Bell nonlocality, we believe that the present results are encouraging, and that the bound entangled state considered here is a promising candidate for disproving the Peres conjecture.

Acknowledgements. This work is supported by the National Research Foundation and the Ministry of Education of Singapore, the UK EPSRC, the EU DIQIP, and the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant PP00P2_138917). DC thanks NB for the hospitality at the University of Bristol.

APPENDIX.– VIOLATION OF THE STEERING INEQUALITY (6) BY THE STATE (7)

The mutually unbiased basis used in the demonstration of steering with state (7) is given by the measurements $\Gamma = \{\Pi^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{5}$, where each measurement projector is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1^{(1)} &= (1,0,0,0);\ \Pi_2^{(1)} = (0,1,0,0); \\ \Pi_3^{(1)} &= (0,0,1,0);\ \Pi_4^{(1)} = (0,0,0,1); \end{aligned} \tag{10a}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1^{(2)} &= (1,1,1,1)/2;\ \Pi_2^{(2)} = (1,1,-1,-1)/2; \qquad \text{(10b)} \\ \Pi_3^{(2)} &= (1,-1,-1,1)/2;\ \Pi_4^{(2)} = (1,-1,1,-1)/2; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1^{(3)} &= (1,-1,-i,-i)/2;\ \Pi_2^{(3)} = (1,-1,i,i)/2; \\ \Pi_3^{(3)} &= (1,1,i,-i)/2;\ \Pi_4^{(3)} = (1,1,-i,i)/2; \end{aligned} \tag{10c}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1^{(4)} &= (1,-i,-i,-1)/2;\ \Pi_2^{(4)} = (1,-i,i,1)/2; \\ \Pi_3^{(4)} &= (1,i,i,-1)/2;\ \Pi_4^{(4)} = (1,i,-i,1)/2; \end{aligned} \tag{10d}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1^{(5)} &= (1,-i,-1,-i)/2;\ \Pi_2^{(5)} = (1,-i,1,i)/2; \\ \Pi_3^{(5)} &= (1,i,-1,i)/2;\ \Pi_4^{(5)} = (1,i,1,-i)/2. \end{aligned} \tag{10e}$$

For each measurement of Bob, we looked for a projective measurement by Alice for which $H(\Pi^k|A_k)$ is minimum. In other words, for each measurement Π^k chosen by Bob, we looked for the measurement that Alice has to choose in order to make the best prediction of Bob's result. Those measurements are defined by the projectors $A_k \equiv \{U_k \Pi_j^{(1)} U_k^{-1}\}_{j=1}^{4}$ which, in the parametrization used in Ref. [23], have the parameters shown in Table I. This optimization procedure lead to $S \approx 3.75$, which is smaller than the right-hand-side of eq. (6), given by $2\log 2 + 3\log 3 \approx 4.7$ (where we have used the log in the basis e). Thus the inequality (6) is violated.

TABLE I: Parameters corresponding to the optimal measurements of Alice, in the parametrization used in [23], attaining the violation shown in (9).

	U_1	U_2	U_3	U_4	U_5
$\lambda[1,1]$	0.948	0.516	-0.849	-0.688	-1.598
$\lambda[1,2]$	-0.005	0.679	0.196	5.976	0.861
$\lambda[1,3]$	1.571	-0.627	0.080	-0.766	1.571
$\lambda[1,4]$	-1.571	-0.509	-0.672	-0.785	2.356
$\lambda[2,1]$	-0.863	0.631	0.765	-0.872	0.704
$\lambda[2,2]$	0.627	-0.819	0.757	0.294	-0.897
$\lambda[2,3]$	2.784	-1.381	-0.978	-0.785	-3.382
$\lambda[2,4]$	-1.571	-0.627	-0.605	-7.506	-1.224
$\lambda[3,1]$	-0.280	-0.092	0.486	-0.077	-0.818
$\lambda[3,2]$	-1.316	-0.341	0.232	-0.180	-1.868
$\lambda[3,3]$	-0.077	1.330	-0.902	0.294	3.023
$\lambda[3,4]$	-1.215	0.679	0.379	5.772	1.571
$\lambda[4,1]$	0.335	-0.717	-0.685	-0.425	-0.224
$\lambda[4,2]$	1.023	-0.024	0.078	-0.173	1.327
$\lambda[4,3]$	0.015	0.131	0.873	0.052	0.335
$\lambda[4,4]$	-0.323	-0.291	-0.854	-0.567	1.007

---

[1] E. Schrodinger, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **31**, 555 (1935).
[2] H.M. Wiseman, S.J. Jones, and A.C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140402 (2007).
[3] E.G. Cavalcanti, S.J. Jones, H.M. Wiseman, and M.D. Reid, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 032112 (2009).
[4] D. Saunders *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **6**, 845 (2010); D.-H. Smith *et al.*, Nat. Commun. **3**, 625 (2012); A. J. Bennett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. X **2**, 031003 (2012); V. Händchen *et al.*, Nat. Phot. **6**, 598 (2012).
[5] B. Wittmann *et al.*, New J. Phys. **14**, 053030 (2012);
[6] C. Branciard, E. G. Cavalcanti, S. P. Walborn, V. Scarani, H. M. Wiseman, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 010301(R) (2012).
[7] S. Pironio, A. Acin, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, S. Massar, and V. Scarani, New J. Phys. **11**, 045021 (2009).
[8] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5239 (1998).
[9] G. Vidal and J.I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5803 (2001); D. Yang, M. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, B. Synak-Radtke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 190501 (2005).
[10] D. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 631 (1983).
[11] H. Maassen, and J. Uffink, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1103 (1988).
[12] S. Wehner and A. Winter, New J. Phys., **12**, 025009

(2010).
[13] H. F. Hofmann and S. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 032103 (2003); O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 117903 (2004).
[14] S. P. Walborn, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 130402 (2011); M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 913 (1989).
[15] M. Berta, M. Christandl, R. Colbeck, J. M. Renes, R. Renner, Nat. Phys. **6**, 659 (2010).
[16] A. Peres, Found Phys. **29**, 589 (1999).
[17] T. Vértesi and N. Brunner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 030403 (2012); W. Dür, *ibid.* **87**, 230402 (2001); R. Augusiak and Pawel Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 010305 (2006).
[18] A. Acín, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 027901 (2001); A. Salles, *et al.*, Quant. Inf. Comp. **10**, 0703-0719 (2010); A. Acin, V. Scarani, M. M. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A 66, 042323 (2002).
[19] I. Devetak, A. Winter, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A **461**, 207 (2005).
[20] J. Sanchez-Ruiz, Phys. Lett. A **201**, 125 (1995).
[21] K. Horodecki, L. Pankowski, M. Horodecki, and P. Horodecki, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **54**, 2621 (2008).
[22] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 160502 (2005).
[23] C. Spengler, M. Huber, B. C. Hiesmayr, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 43, 385306 (2010).